



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,129	02/13/2001	Mihal Lazaridis	555255012193	3132

7590

12/26/2001

David B. Cochran, Esq.
Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

EXAMINER

EDELMAN, BRADLEY E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 12/26/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/782,129

Applicant(s)

LAZARIDIS ET AL.

Examiner

Bradley Edelman

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). <u>11</u> . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2, 5, 10</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

DETAILED ACTION

This application is a divisional of Application No. 09/087,623, now U.S. Patent No. 6,219,694.

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-23, 25, and 26, drawn to a system for forwarding messages to a mobile device according to a redirection event, classified in class 709, subclass 206.
 - II. Claim 24, drawn to a two-way message redirection routing system, classified in class 709, subclass 238.
 - III. Claims 27-29, drawn to a server/client distributed message processing system, classified in class 709, subclass 203.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I, II, and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention I has separate utility such as allowing messages to be forwarded to a user who is not present at his/her desktop computer. Invention II has separate utility such as selectively routing messages between a portable and non-portable device. Invention III has separate utility, such as implementing a client/server system that allows network messaging to mobile devices. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with David Cochran on November 29, 2001 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-23, 25, and 26. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 24 and 27-29 withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In considering claim 1, although the claim includes the limitation of continuously redirecting the received messages if the host system senses that the user is not in the vicinity of the host system, the specification does not describe *how* the system would sense that a user is no longer in vicinity of the host system. The specification merely asserts the inclusion of the vicinity sensing system, but does not describe how the sensing system would be implemented. Thus, the specification would not enable a person having skill in the art to make the invention as claimed.

Claims 2-22 depend from claim 1, and so are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 6, 9-10, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chase Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,974,238, hereinafter "Chase"), in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, August 1993 ("Personal Computer Environmental Control Via a Proximity," IBM TDB, August 1993, Vol. 36, pp. 343-346, TDB-ACC-NO: NN9308343, hereinafter "IBM").

In considering claim 1, Chase discloses a method of redirecting messages from a host system (host computer C) operated by a user to the user's mobile data communication device (handheld computer H), comprising the steps of:

configuring an external redirection event at the host system (col. 16, lines 12-22; the event is the waking up of the data synchronizer in response to a message from the remote device);

receiving messages at the host system, and in response to the redirection event, continuously redirecting the received messages to the user's mobile data communication device (col. 12, lines 1-7, 16-19, 27-37; col. 16, lines 20-22; col. 9, line 59 – col. 10, line 7; wherein the receipt of a packet from the remote device wakes up the synchronization program, which then continuously redirects e-mails received at the host to the mobile device).

However, Chase fails to disclose that the external event is the host system sensing whether the user is in the vicinity of the host system, wherein the continuous redirection continues as long as the user is not in the vicinity of the host system. Nonetheless, the use of a proximity sensor to effect processing of messages in a network messaging system is well known, as evidenced by IBM. In a similar art, IBM discloses a proximity sensor at a host computer (pc) that senses when a user is away from the computer, and in response configures the host system to send an auto-reply upon receipt of messages from message senders. The auto-reply process then stops when the user comes back within the proximity of the computer. See IBM text – p. 1, first paragraph; p. 2, last line – p. 3, line 2. Such a system is useful to the pc user

because the user would want to notify message senders when the user is away from the computer and thus cannot view messages.

An additional useful feature for users who are away from their home computers is a redirection system, as taught by Chase, which lets users receive messages even when away from their home computers. Given the proximity sensor taught by IBM, in combination with the message redirection system taught by Chase, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of using the proximity sensor taught by IBM as an external event means for triggering the redirection of received messages in the system taught by Chase, so that when a user is away from his pc, not only are message senders notified to that effect, but the user can also receive the messages, view the messages, and perhaps respond to the messages. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use the proximity sensor taught by IBM with the message redirection system taught by Chase.

In considering claim 2, Chase further discloses that messages generated at the mobile device, and sent to the host system before being transmitted to the recipients, are configured such that the messages use a first address associated with the host system as the originating address, wherein messages generated at either of the devices share the first address (col. 5, lines 59-65; since PIM and other information on the mobile device and on the host system contain identical replicated data, they must both share a common sender address in generating messages).

Although Chase does not explicitly disclose generating group reply messages, Examiner takes official notice that this feature is well known in e-mail systems. It would have been obvious to include group reply messages in the system taught by Chase in order to decrease the amount of writing necessary by a user sending e-mail.

In considering claim 3, Chase inherently discloses storing configuration information regarding the mobile device at the host system (this information is necessary to allow the host system to interface with the mobile device).

In considering claim 6, Chase further discloses that the messages are addressed using a sender and receiver address (col. 9, lines 58-65, wherein such an addressing system is inherent in e-mail messaging), including the steps of:

determining whether the receiver address is associated with the mobile data communication device (this must occur for each received message);

if the receiver address is associated with the mobile data communication device, then determining a network address of the mobile data communication device (inherent, as discussed above), and repackaging the messages into electronic envelopes using the receiver address and the network address of the mobile device (col. 12, lines 7-16; col. 14, lines 51-67); and

extracting the messages from the envelope at the mobile device (inherent), and displaying the messages at the mobile device using the sender and receiver address (again, inherent in an e-mail system), so that it appears as though the mobile device is

Art Unit: 2153

the host system (again, since PIM and other information on the mobile device and on the host system contain identical replicated data, the information on the mobile device will appear as though it is on the host system).

In considering claims 9 and 10, the combined teaching of Chase and IBM discloses the use of a plurality of redirection events at the host system, including the external events of receiving a message from the mobile device to start redirection (Chase, col. 16, lines 20-22), and sensing that the user is not in the vicinity of the system (IBM).

In considering claim 14, the system taught by Chase and IBM fails to disclose the network event being a message from a remote computer system other than the mobile device. Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that issuing control commands for software and hardware on a host computer from across a network is well known. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to send a redirection message from a remote device on the network other than the mobile device to signal redirection in the system taught by Chase and IBM so that the trigger can be chosen by a user from anywhere on the network, should the user be away from the host system and the mobile device.

In considering claim 15, Chase further discloses the mobile device is a hand-held, wirelessly enabled, palm-top computer (Fig. 1D).

In considering claim 16, Chase further discloses that the device can receive both voice and non-voice messages (col. 7, lines 44-45; col. 9, lines 59-65).

5. Claims 11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chase and IBM, and further in view of Kuki (EP Patent No. 772,327 A2, hereinafter "Sharp").

In considering claim 11, although the system taught by Chase and IBM discloses one or more events which can trigger redirection of data elements, it fails to disclose a calendar alarm as one of the events. Nonetheless, the use of calendar alarms to trigger redirection of data between a PC and a PDA is well known, as evidenced by Sharp ("appointment designation", col. 8, lines 3-6; see also Abstract). Thus, given the teaching of Sharp, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of using a calendar alarm to trigger redirection of messages, as taught by Sharp, in the wireless synchronization system taught by Chase and IBM, so that a user can schedule regular synchronization sessions for larger sets of data at the user's convenience. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include scheduled forwarding, as taught by Sharp, in the synchronization system taught by Chase and IBM.

In considering claim 25, the combined teaching of Chase and IBM, as previously discussed, discloses a method of redirecting information from a host system to a mobile data communication device (Chase, Fig. 1D), comprising the steps of:

providing a set of redirection triggers at the host system (i.e. IBM: detecting the proximity of a user – p. 2-3, Chase: receiving a message from the mobile device – col. 16, lines 20-22);

detecting that a trigger event has occurred at the host system (i.e. detecting that a user has left the vicinity of the computer, or detecting a message from the mobile device);

setting a trigger flag in response to receipt of the trigger event (inherent);

if the trigger flag is set, then continuously redirecting received information from the host system to the mobile device (Chase, col. 12, lines 1-37).

However, the combined system taught by Chase and IBM does not disclose a selection of the trigger events, and setting a trigger flag if a detected event matches a selected event. Nonetheless, selection of different trigger events in a message forwarding system is well known, as evidenced by Kuki. In a similar art, Kuki discloses that a user can select particular events (such as set calendar events, turning on a mobile device, inputting a mail forwarding-request signal), which can be activated or deactivated in order to forward messages from a host system to a mobile device (col. 5, lines 37-43; col. 6, lines 22-30, col. 7, lines 10-20; col. 15, lines 28-33). Thus, given the teaching of Kuki, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of allowing a user to select particular trigger events to

Art Unit: 2153

trigger continuous forwarding in the system taught by Chase and IBM, to give the user greater control over which messages to receive, and when to receive them.

6. Claims 12, 23, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chase and IBM, and further in view of Kumomura (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,219).

In considering claim 12, although the system taught by Chase and IBM discloses one or more events which can trigger redirection of data elements, it fails to disclose a screen saver activation as one of the events. Nonetheless, the use of a screen saver activation to trigger redirection of electronic messages is well known in the art, as evidenced by Kumomura. In a similar art, Kumomura discloses a system for receiving electronic mail at a client machine, wherein received messages are redirected to another networked device if a screen saver is activated (col. 4, lines 58-61, 64-65). Thus, given the teaching of Kumomura, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of using a screen saver activation as a redirection event in the system taught by Chase and IBM, so that a user who is most likely away from her host computer can still receive incoming messages at her mobile device (see Kumomura, col. 4, lines 61-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the screen saver activation feature taught by Kumomura in the message redirection system taught by Chase and IBM.

Claim 23 contains similar limitations to combined claims 1, 9, and 12, and is rejected for the same reasons as stated previously.

7. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chase, in view of Kumomura, and further in view of Hawkins et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,274, hereinafter, "Hawkins").

In considering claim 26, as discussed previously, the combined teaching of Chase, and Kumomura discloses configuring a redirector application to continuously redirect messages from a desktop to a mobile device when it senses one of a plurality of redirection events including a screen saver activation (Kumomura) and a mobile device command event. Chase further discloses that the messages can include e-mail messages, calendar data, and meeting reminders (col. 9, lines 19-26). However, neither Chase nor Kumomura discloses that the *user* can submit the mobile device command event. Nonetheless, it is well known in the art that users can transmit messages from a mobile device to their host computers to signal the host computer to redirect messages, as evidenced by Hawkins. In a similar art, Hawkins describes a PDA/host computer synchronization system wherein a remote user can signal redirection of PIM data from the host computer to the mobile device when the user presses a synchronization button (col. 2, lines 5-8; col. 3, lines 22-34). Thus, given the teaching of Hawkins, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of allowing remote users to selectively trigger the redirection events at the host system, in order to allow greater user control

over the system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to allow a user to select when messages should be redirected in the system taught by Chase and Kumomura.

8. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chase, IBM, and Kumomura, in view of Rakavy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,913,040).

In considering claim 13, the system taught by Chase, IBM, and Kumomura fails to explicitly disclose the trigger event including a keyboard timeout signal. Nonetheless, the use keyboard timeout signals to trigger screen saver activation is well known, as evidenced by Rakavy. In a similar art, Rakavy discloses a system for triggering a network communication between a home computer and a remote computer, wherein a keyboard timeout will activate a screen saver and thus trigger the network communication (col. 7, line 63 - col. 8, line 3). Given the teaching of Rakavy, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use a keyboard timeout to activate a screen saver, thereby activating redirection of the messages disclosed in the system taught by Chase, IBM, and Kumomura, because (1) the use of keyboard timeout signals to trigger a screen saver activation is notoriously well known in the art, and (2) a keyboard timeout is a likely to signify that a user is no longer near her computer. Thus, a user would want messages redirected to her mobile device is she is not near her computer. Therefore, it would have been obvious for an internal event in the system taught by Chase, IBM, and Kumomura to include a keyboard timeout signal, as taught by Rakavy.

9. Claims 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chase and IBM, in view of Narasimhan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,165, hereinafter, "Narasimhan").

In considering claim 17, although the system taught by Chase and IBM teaches substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose the inclusion of a preferred list for limiting redirecting to senders on a preferred list. Nonetheless, the use of preferred lists for filtering e-mail messages is well known, as evidenced by Narasimhan. In a similar art, Narasimhan discloses a system for redirecting messages from a host system (source server 103) to a portable data communication device (receiver 133; col. 4, lines 1-40), wherein a message filter is applied to the redirected messages (col. 5, lines 3-17), the filter including a preferred list ("messages sent by a particular individual", col. 5, lines 13-17). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include such a preferred list in any e-mail forwarding system so that only the most important messages are sent to the user, thus saving bandwidth and saving time for the user.

In considering claim 18, Narasimhan further discloses that the user can add and subtract senders from the preferred list (col. 5, lines 13-17).

In considering claim 19, Narasimhan further discloses that the list is activated or deactivated at the host system (server 103 maintains the message processing).

In considering claim 20, Chase discloses that activation of the redirection at the host can be controlled via a command sent from the mobile device. Thus, given that feature, and given the knowledge of the preferred list taught by Narasimhan, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to allow a user to activate or deactivate the list from the remote device, in order to give the user greater control over which messages to receive.

In considering claim 21, Narasimhan further discloses that the user can add and subtract senders from the preferred list by configuring the host system (col. 5, lines 13-17).

In considering claim 22, as mentioned with regard to claim 20, the combined teaching of Chase and Narasimhan further suggests the desirability for the mobile device to transmit a message to the host system to add or subtract senders from the list (to give the user greater control over the system).

10. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chase and IBM, in view of Ulrich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,735, hereinafter "Ulrich").

In considering claim 4, Chase inherently discloses storing the network address of the mobile device at the host system (this address is necessary to allow the host system to contact the mobile device). Chase further discloses including an indication of the

types of data that the mobile device can receive and process (col. 9, lines 39-49, the indication is inherent in order for the system to know which files to convert). However, Chase does not explicitly specify that the "data" comprises attachments. Nonetheless, including an indication of which attachments an e-mail system can receive for e-mail messages in a PC/PDA wireless synchronization system is well known, as evidenced by Ulrich. In a similar art, Ulrich discloses a PC/PDA wireless synchronization system including e-mail (Abstract), wherein a user can specify which attachments the mobile device can receive and process (col. 12, lines 30-37). Thus, given the teaching of Ulrich, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of processing e-mail attachments in the manner taught by Ulrich, when synchronizing data in the system taught by Chase to prevent files from dominating or overflowing the data storage capacity of the mobile device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the e-mail attachment processing method disclosed by Ulrich in the synchronization system taught by Chase and IBM.

In considering claim 5, Chase inherently discloses storing the type of the mobile device at the host system (this information is necessary to allow the host system to interface with the mobile device).

11. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chase, IBM, and Ulrich, and further in view of Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,092,114, hereinafter "Shaffer").

In considering claim 7, although the system taught by Chase, IBM, and Ulrich discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose a means for handling attachments including transmitting attachment replication data to a device capable of processing the attachment if the mobile device cannot receive and process the attachment. Nonetheless, forwarding an attachment to a device capable of processing the attachment if a recipient device cannot receive the message is well known, as evidenced by Shaffer. In a similar art, Shaffer discloses a system for sending e-mail attachments, wherein if a target client device can receive and process an attachment, the attachment is sent directly to the client device, but if the client device cannot process the attachment, the attachment is sent to a remote server capable of receiving and processing the message (Fig. 2). Thus, given the teaching of Shaffer, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of including the attachment processing method described by Shaffer for the attachments disclosed by Chase, IBM, and Ulrich, so that the user of the mobile device can view at least the substantive matter of important attachments. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use an attachment processing method such as disclosed by Shaffer for the mobile e-mail and attachment synchronization system taught by Chase, IBM, and Ulrich.

In considering claim 8, Shaffer further discloses that the attachment is sound file (col. 5, lines 61-63). Chase further discloses the ability to process sound files (col. 7, lines 42-45).

12. Claims 4-5 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chase and IBM, in view of Moriya (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,140).

In considering claim 4, Chase inherently discloses storing the network address of the mobile device at the host system (this address is necessary to allow the host system to contact the mobile device). Chase further discloses including an indication of the types of data that the mobile device can receive and process (col. 9, lines 39-49, the indication is inherent in order for the system to know which files to convert). However, Chase does not explicitly specify that the "data" comprises attachments. Nonetheless, including an indication of which attachments an e-mail system can receive for e-mail messages in a PC/PDA wireless synchronization system is well known, as evidenced by Moriya. In a similar art, Moriya discloses a method of redirecting a message, comprising the steps of: receiving a message (e-mail) at a host system (central facility 2), the message having an attachment (attached image data; col. 8, lines 25-28); separating the attachment from the message (col. 8, lines 35-38, 53-58); and redirecting the message from the host system to the mobile device (col. 8, lines 53-56). Moriya further discloses determining which attachments the mobile device can or cannot receive according to a mobile device profile database stored at the host (see col. 7-8). Thus, given the teaching of Moriya, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of processing e-mail attachments in the manner taught by Moriya, when synchronizing data in the system taught by Chase

Art Unit: 2153

to prevent files from dominating or overflowing the data storage capacity of the mobile device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the e-mail attachment processing method disclosed by Moriya in the synchronization system taught by Chase and IBM.

In considering claim 5, Chase inherently discloses storing the type of the mobile device at the host system (this information is necessary to allow the host system to interface with the mobile device).

13. Claims 7-8 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chase, IBM, and Moriya, and further in view of Theimer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,493,692, hereinafter "Theimer").

In considering claim 7, although the system taught by Chase, IBM, and Moriya discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose a means for handling attachments including transmitting attachment replication data to a device capable of processing the attachment if the mobile device cannot receive and process the attachment. Nonetheless, redirection of messages from a host system to a display device associated with a mobile device and capable of processing the messages is well known, as evidenced by Theimer. In a similar art, Theimer discloses a system for selectively delivering electronic messages to one or more users who are using a mobile communication device (col. 24, lines 49-55), wherein the messages will be redirected

Art Unit: 2153

from a host (server) to an appropriate display device according to device characteristics, the context, and the message characteristics (col. 25, lines 17-38).

Thus, given the teaching of Theimer, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of forwarding the attachments removed by the host in the system taught by Moriya to an appropriate display device, as taught by Theimer, so that a user at a remote location can view the attachment immediately (see Theimer, col. 25, lines 23-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to forward the attachments disclosed by the combined teaching of Chase, IBM, and Moriya to a user via the display device system taught by Theimer.

In considering claim 8, Chase further discloses the ability to process sound files (col. 7, lines 42-45).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley Edelman whose telephone number is (703) 306-3041. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone numbers

Art Unit: 2153

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7201.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-3900.



GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

BE
December 3, 2001